

### **REMARKS**

Claim 47 has been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gifford et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,648,834) in view of Huguenin (U.S. Patent No. 5,832,698). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention is directed to a rewindable flexible film, which, before formed into a container, can be wound in a roll where it occupies a considerably reduced space. The flexible film is stiffened at desired locations at the moment of the formation of the ultimate container. Thus, the flexible film of the present invention is not an intermediate product in the sense of the product that lasts for a limited period of time within the overall working process, but rather is a product that may last for an indefinite length of time, that is, until energy is administered thereto. Accordingly, the present invention is not directed to a final product but rather to a flexible film which may be considered as an intermediate product, only in the sense where the cycle of use starts from the base film and ends with a stiffened final package. Thus, the present invention is directed to a product that has its own autonomy since its cycle of use may be determined by the user. More specifically, the present invention is directed to a roll of flexible film which includes a supporting film for a modifying substance and an activator which has not reacted with the modifying substance, all of which coexist as a flexible film on the roll until its use is desired.

The Examiner, in rejecting claim 47 of the present application, argues that the Gifford et al. patent discloses a flexible film for obtaining structurally stable objects, the film being at least in those regions where the obtained objects are required to be substantially rigid, with a structurally transformable substance which is inert with respect to the film (see column 1, lines 30-35) and with at least one modifying agent of the substance (see column 1, line 61).

One of the main differences between the present invention and the Gifford et al. patent appears to be in the fact that the Gifford et al. patent is concerned with a method of forming a rigid package from a flexible film in one continuous operation rather than providing a rewindable flexible film which acts as an intermediate product which can be later formed into a final product by following the teachings of the present invention. Thus, in the case of the Gifford et al. patent,

the entire package is made rigid from a flexible film by initiating a cross-linking reaction in the flexible film through the application of a high energy radiation source. On the other hand, in the present invention, the rewindable flexible film has its own autonomy and thus can be merely stored as a flexible film on a roll until it is desired to be formed into a rigid product. In addition when the formation into a rigid product takes place, this formation is selective in that only desired and selective portions of the flexible film are made rigid rather than the entire flexible film being made rigid and this is due to the particular autonomy of the flexible film. Accordingly, it is believed that the Gifford et al. patent fails to suggest the Applicants' inventive contribution.

The Examiner, of course, recognizes that the Gifford et al. patent in failing to recognize the Applicants' inventive contribution, fails to disclose that the flexible film is rewindable. Thus, the Examiner relies upon the Huguenin patent in an attempt to suggest this feature. However, it should be understood that the rewindable feature of the present invention must be taken in context with a flexible film which has its own autonomy, that is, one containing a structurally transformable substance together with a modifying agent which is adapted to be activated by the administration of a source of energy. Relying upon the teaching of the Huguenin patent which merely shows the winding of a flexible film cannot possibly suggest the present invention.

As the Examiner will note, claims 48-51 have been added to the present application, newly added claim 48 more specifically defining the flexible film of the present in the form of a roll where it can be retained for an indefinite length of time, that is, until energy is administered thereto. Thus, it is believed that all of the claims of the present application clearly define an inventive contribution which is not recognized by either of the references relied upon by the Examiner, either alone or in combination.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of all of the claims of the present application are respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

**Conclusion**

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Mr. Joseph A. Kolasch (Reg. No. 22,463) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 12, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
James T. Eller, Jr.

Registration No.: 39,538

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant